

Date: Thu, 28 Jul 94 04:30:13 PDT  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #333  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Thu, 28 Jul 94                      Volume 94 : Issue 333

Today's Topics:

                    CW is FUN!! reprise  
                    Isn't Ham Radio a Hobby?  
                    RE:Isn't Ham Radio a Hobby? (2 msgs)  
                    What is wrong with ham radio (2 msgs)  
                    Where's the key?

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: Wed, 27 Jul 94 08:54:47 -0500  
From: news.delphi.com!usenet@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: CW is FUN!! reprise  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Judging from an email response my post was mis-understood, sorry.

In a more lucid stat, i propose!

Instead of claiming that "my mode is better than your mode..."  
how about a re-evaluation of the current state of spectrum  
management at HF. I would love to see a digital-modes subband  
on bands like 20, 15 and 40 or 80. With access granted to tech-plus  
licenceses. A formalized 25 (?) Khz chunk at about 7075, 14075...  
would be awesome. Also, there is nothing stopping digital modes  
in the novice bands...maybe (is it CW only???)

You better start swimmin or you'll sink like a stone...

73 de n1qdq

-----  
Date: 27 Jul 94 13:29:47 GMT  
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu  
Subject: Isn't Ham Radio a Hobby?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In regards to limiting the duration of of licenses, what about the kids out there who are entering amateur radio? Will you limit a seven year old who may/cannot (though there are some very bright 7yr olds) comprehend material for general? Of course they cann remember the question pools through memorization, but I thought that was only an aid to passing.

I know several techs and tech+'s who are very happy operating VHF, UHF, etc. Why should they be forced to study for more privileges than they desire? Sounds a bit elitest to me. I thought the Ham Community is trying to encourage people to become involved. Correct me if I am wrong. By forcing an upgrade I believe we would be losing some valuable assets to the Art/Hobby.

If people are worried about losing the HF spectrum, an earlier post stated (correctly) that it is the microwave freqs. that are on the auction block. Also, most of the new technology is created on these bands.

73's de KC5GWA  
Ready to upgrade to General, didn't complain about the code, and read manuals not the question pools(I am using them as a review)  
BDORECK@BEACH.UTMB.EDU

-----  
Date: Wed, 27 Jul 1994 14:02:37 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!cs.utexas.edu!bcm!  
news.msfc.nasa.gov!news.larc.nasa.gov!saimiri.primite.wisc.edu!news.doit.wisc.edu!  
F181-073.net.wisc.edu!bmicales@network.  
Subject: RE:Isn't Ham Radio a Hobby?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

>In regards to limiting the duration of of licenses, what about the kids out  
>there who are entering amateur radio? Will you limit a seven year old who  
>may/cannot (though there are some very bright 7yr olds) comprehend material for  
>general? Of course they cann remember the question pools through memorization,  
>but I thought that was only an aid to passing.

>I know several techs and tech+'s who are very happy operating VHF, UHF, etc.

>Why should they be forced to study for more privileges than they desire? Sounds  
>a bit elitest to me. I thought the Ham Community is trying to encourage  
>people to become involved. Correct me if I am wrong. By forcing an upgrade I  
>believe we would be losing some valuable assets to the Art/Hobby.

>If people are worried about losing the HF spectrum, an earlier post stated  
>(correctly) that it is the microwave freqs. that are on the auction block.  
>Also, most of the new technology is created on these bands.

Finally a voice of reason! Thanks Bren.

Bruce Micales WA2DEU

-----  
Date: Wed, 27 Jul 1994 21:21:34 GMT  
From: murky.apple.com!trib.apple.com!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!  
usenet.ins.cwru.edu!ns.mcs.kent.edu!kira.cc.uakron.edu!malgudi.oar.net!witch!ted!  
mjsilva@decwrl.dec.com  
Subject: RE:Isn't Ham Radio a Hobby?  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <01HF70IVPNCM000PDS@BEACH.UTMB.EDU>, Bren Doreck (Bren.Doreck@utmb.EDU) writes:

>In regards to limiting the duration of of licenses, what about the kids out  
>there who are entering amateur radio? Will you limit a seven year old who  
>may/cannot (though there are some very bright 7yr olds) comprehend material for  
>general? Of course they cann remember the question pools through memorization,  
>but I thought that was only an aid to passing.

It really never occurred to me to take into account our population of seven-year-olds. I guess I would say that, if they were smart enough to pass a test when they were seven, moving up one grade should be a snap by the time they're twelve (I had proposed a 5 year limit). And I had noted that we would need a no-code equivalent of the General, for those who didn't want to learn the code.

>

>I know several techs and tech+'s who are very happy operating VHF, UHF, etc.  
>Why should they be forced to study for more privileges than they desire? Sounds  
>a bit elitest to me. I thought the Ham Community is trying to encourage  
>people to become involved. Correct me if I am wrong. By forcing an upgrade I  
>believe we would be losing some valuable assets to the Art/Hobby.

"Elitist" suggests a judgement based on unimportant factors. Would we say it was elitist to require a doctor to know the difference between a vein and an artery? If the purpose of the entry-level licenses is to get people into the hobby, shouldn't we expect them to show some

evidence of learning something once they're here (Part 97.1 again...), rather than to just spend their time chewing the rag? The very fact that the Tech license gives so many privileges relative to the test difficulty is what makes me suggest that we at least limit its duration. Look at the General test (3B), and you'll see that there's not \*that\* much to learn in five years. And, no, I don't think that people who know nothing more in five years than when they first got their ticket are a valuable asset to the hobby.

>

>73's de KC5GWA

>Ready to upgrade to General, didn't complain about the code, and read manuals  
>not the question pools(I am using them as a review)

>

In all seriousness, good for you, and good luck.

73,

Mike, KK6GM

-----

Date: 27 Jul 1994 10:07:17 -0400

From: news1.digex.net!digex.net!not-for-mail@uunet.uu.net

Subject: What is wrong with ham radio

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <RFM.94Jul26173243@urth.eng.sun.com>, Richard McAllister wrote:

>

> The cause-and-effect goes the other way. The people who can write good code  
> have lots of things they could be working on, only a few of which require an  
> HF license. They'll look at the time it takes to learn the code, and figure  
> they could spend that time doing something more interesting. I did this for  
> 20 years, until the codeless tech license came along.

>

> Rich

> --

> Rich McAllister (rfm@eng.sun.com)

I went from 0 to 15 wpm in 30 days. Same w/a fellow ham across town. We both also write s/w. If you can learn C, PASCAL, etc you can learn the morse code in less time than it takes complaining about it. It was we, the code hams who pushed for the codeless ticket. Now all your whining and complaining is turning your early supporters into opposition. You knew what the deal was when you became a member of the community and instead of making helpful suggestions you do nothing but attack your fellow amateurs.

To think that the collective complaining to the FCC will have a positive effect on eliminating CW requirements is laughable. The FCC's attitude

toward chronic complainers is that of a nuisance, they let the ARRL handle those issues. How can anyone muster support in the ARRL when you do nothing but foster opposition?

I was in favor of reduced code requirements and a more challenging technical exam, but with all the whining going on against CW and CW operators if there were a collective poll/vote taken today I would vote to keep things status quo until there was a serious attitude adjustment.

Andy

-----  
Date: 28 Jul 1994 00:06:58 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!news.cerf.net!gopher.sdsc.edu!nic-nac.CSU.net!  
charnel.ecst.csuchico.edu!olivea!korie!news2me.EBay.Sun.COM!engnews2.Eng.Sun.COM!  
usenet@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: What is wrong with ham radio  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <paulf.775348434@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU>  
paulf@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU (Paul Flaherty) writes:

>I did it [avoided learning code] myself for about ten years.  
>But then I finally came across someone  
>who actually had a clue about how to learn CW, and discovered it didn't take  
>that much effort when done right. [...]  
>[...] that the number one cofactor in learning Morse is motivation.

Yes, yes. The problem is not the code so much as it is attitudes toward the code. Another path to ameliorating the harm done by the code requirements is to make sure prospective hams know how much effort is involved (less than they may think), and that they know how code could be useful to them. The codeless Tech license is useful here by getting people engaged. Even though I'm in the code-requirements-are-bad camp, I certainly think hams that help newcomers overcome their resistance to code by advising on good learning technique and explaining the fun things they do with their code knowledge are on the side of the angels.

If the problem in learning code is motivation, which I'm not doubting, people who think widespread knowledge of code is a good thing need to think about the effectiveness of various motivating techniques. "You can't have your dessert until you finish your spinach" has never been one of the better ones. "Look at those people over there having a ball! Don't you wish you could do that?" is a pretty good one.

Rich

--

Rich McAllister (rfm@eng.sun.com)

-----

Date: Tue, 26 Jul 94 23:41:00 -0400

From: newsserver.jvnc.net!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!udel!news.sprintlink.net!  
coyote.channel1.com!channel1!alan.wilensky@RUTGERS.EDU

Subject: Where's the key?

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

PF>Yes, but in the process, it will occupy 10db more spectrum. Either  
PF>you get noise immunity or spectral efficiency. Not both. Oh yeah,  
PF>make sure that said system is as cost effective as the one you're  
PF>claiming is obsolete.

Granted, but due to the natural pauses in conversation, the coding  
allows overlapping use of the spread bandwidth. According to information  
theorem, this allows a greater scale of efficiency in regards to message  
content. For a given amount of bandwidth.

In regards to cost, large scale integration is now reducing design and  
manufacturing costs, as well as the complexity and level of knowledge  
required to assemble and test such devices.

Alan Wilensky, N1SS0  
General Manager  
Interactive Workplace Division  
Vicom, LTD.  
Phone: Edmonton Office  
11603 165 St.  
abm@world.std.com

---

, CmpQwk #UNREG, UNREGISTERED EVALUATION COPY

-----

Date: 27 Jul 94 22:27:55 GMT

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!biosci!headwall.Stanford.EDU!abercrombie.Stanford.EDU!  
paulf@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <40.2452.2427@channel1.com>,

<paulf.775249918@abercrombie.stanford.edu>, <3142bf\$90r@chnews.intel.com>

Subject : Re: Where's the key?

Cecil\_A\_Moore@ccm.hf.intel.com writes:

>Hi Paul, I didn't know spectrum was measured in db.

It's an RF colloquialism. "Next time, use about 6db more coffee beans!"

>I would say that solid copy without any interference to anyone else  
>on the band \_is\_ both.

If you're the only one doing it, true. But when reuse approaches spread factor, guess what -- the noise floor comes up to the narrowband equivalent (otherwise energy is not conserved, a bad thing). Empirically, we've seen this in the SF Bay Area on the 902-928 band, which is now less than useful given the large number of commercial SS systems operating there.

--

-=Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."  
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, \_A Nation of Victims\_

-----

Date: 27 Jul 1994 14:43:07 -0700

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!sdd.hp.com!math.ohio-state.edu!howland.reston.ans.net!  
news.intercon.com!udel!news.sprintlink.net!news.world.net!news.teleport.com!  
news.teleport.com!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <RFM.94Jul26173243@urth.eng.sun.com>,  
<MFcDkiubGYw4066yn@access.digex.net>, <CtLtzo.IpJ@news.Hawaii.Edu>ews.t  
Subject : Re: What is wrong with ham radio

Jeffrey Herman (jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu) wrote:

: In article <MFcDkiubGYw4066yn@access.digex.net> domonkos@access.digex.net (Andy  
Domonkos) writes:

: >

: >I went from 0 to 15 wpm in 30 days. Same w/a fellow ham across town.

: >We both also write s/w. If you can learn C, PASCAL, etc you can learn

: >the morse code in less time than it takes complaining about it.

HORSE PUCKEY!

: >"If you can learn C, PASCAL, etc"

Which you can perform at your nominal mental proccessing speed....

: > you can learn the morse code

Which must be performed at a speed which may exceed the processing speed of some persons.....

Obviously a fat-headed argument.

(Much whining about other folk's whining deleted)

: >  
: >To think that the collective complaining to the FCC will have a positive  
: >effect on eliminating CW requirements is laughable. The FCC's attitude  
: >toward chronic complainers is that of a nuisance, they let the ARRL  
: >handle those issues. How can anyone muster support in the ARRL when  
: >you do nothing but foster opposition?

Imagine that! All those awful people against excessive code requirements not garnering support from the omnipotent, {all bow}, ARRL, (Anally Retentive Regulation Lovers).

Shame on them for exercising their right of dissent. Why won't they raise their voices in a mighty "HEIL ARRL"?

BAH!

: >  
: >I was in favor of reduced code requirements and a more  
: >challenging technical exam, but with all the whining going on against  
: >CW and CW operators if there were a collective poll/vote taken today I  
: >would vote to keep things status quo until there was a serious attitude  
: >adjustment.  
: >  
: >Andy

And as soon as the chronological and/or attitudinal OF's get that adjustment we can correct the Morse code weighting imbalance in our testing.

: What a wonderfully written article! I think I'll save it and repost  
: it once per month during this monthly code debate; hope you don't  
: mind, Andy.

At least re-post something that is not all whining and specious arguments....

: 73,  
: Jeff NH6IL  
: jeffrey@math.hawaii.edu

73's  
Gene



KB7WIP

-----  
Date: 27 Jul 1994 16:39:52 GMT  
From: elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!usc!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!news-  
feed-1.peachnet.edu!news.duke.edu!eff!news.kei.com!ssd.intel.com!chnews!  
scorpion.ch.intel.com!cmoore@ames.arpa  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <paulf.775249434@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU>,  
<RFM.94Jul26173243@urth.eng.sun.com>, <MFcDkiubGYw4066yn@access.digex.net>el.co  
Subject : Re: What is wrong with ham radio

In article <MFcDkiubGYw4066yn@access.digex.net>,  
Andy Domonkos <domonkos@access.digex.net> wrote:

>  
>You knew what the deal was when you became a member of the community and  
>instead of making helpful suggestions you do nothing but attack your  
>fellow amateurs.

You aren't attacking your fellow amateurs, are you?

>How can anyone muster support in the ARRL when you do nothing but foster  
>opposition?

You aren't fostering opposition, are you?

>... I would vote to keep  
>things status quo until there was a serious attitude adjustment. Andy

You want changes before allowing things to change?  
Gee, Andy, I wish you wouldn't complain so much. :-)

73, Cecil, KG7BK, 00TC (Not speaking for Intel)

-----  
Date: 27 Jul 94 22:33:54 GMT  
From: unix.sri.com!headwall.Stanford.EDU!abercrombie.Stanford.EDU!  
paulf@hplabs.hpl.hp.com  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <RFM.94Jul25100008@urth.eng.sun.com>,  
<paulf.775249434@abercrombie.Stanford.EDU>, <RFM.94Jul26173243@urth.eng.sun.com>  
Subject : Re: What is wrong with ham radio

rfm@urth.eng.sun.com (Richard McAllister) writes:

>The cause-and-effect goes the other way. The people who can write good code  
>have lots of things they could be working on, only a few of which require an  
>HF license. They'll look at the time it takes to learn the code, and figure  
>they could spend that time doing something more interesting. I did this for  
>20 years, until the codeless tech license came along.

I did it myself for about ten years. But then I finally came across someone  
who actually had a clue about how to learn CW, and discovered it didn't take  
that much effort when done right. That was the 5 wpm exam. My study for the  
20 WPM exam was conducted solely in parallel with driving to work, so it didn't  
detract from any really useful time.

All of this is consistent with the studies that have been done which indicate  
that the number one cofactor in learning Morse is motivation.

--

-=>Paul Flaherty, N9FZX | "The National Anthem has become The Whine."  
->paulf@Stanford.EDU | -- Charles Sykes, \_A Nation of Victims\_

-----

Date: 26 Jul 1994 16:30:38 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!news.cerf.net!gopher.sdsc.edu!news.tc.cornell.edu!  
travelers.mail.cornell.edu!news.kei.com!ssd.intel.com!chnews!  
scorpion.ch.intel.com!cmoore@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <carreiroCtHDz1.1rx@netcom.com>, <310thm\$ept@chnews.intel.com>,  
<31282t\$ctr@ccnet.ccnet.com>sd.  
Subject : Re: Where's the key?

In article <31282t\$ctr@ccnet.ccnet.com>,  
Bob Wilkins n6fri <rwilkins@ccnet.com> wrote:  
>Cecil\_A\_Moore@ccm.hf.intel.com wrote:  
>  
>: Hi Paul, time to update your knowledge. SS gets through when CW can't.  
>: Of course, SS electronics are more complex than CW electronics.  
>  
>While your Slow Speed may be superior due to band width my CDMA system  
>will beat your Code Wave electronics.> Bob Wilkins

Hi Bob, FYI, SS stands for Spread Spectrum of which your CDMA is a sub-  
set... what the heck is Slow Speed? ... and I'm wondering if SS/CDMA  
would beat Coherent CW (CCW).

73, Cecil, KG7BK, 00TC (Not speaking for Intel)

-----  
End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #333

\*\*\*\*\*